

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/033,920 | 01/03/2002 | Tomoyuki Kayama | 217916US0 | 2282 | |
| 22850 | 7590 01/29/2003 | | | | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. | | | EXAMINER | | |
| 1940 DUKE | | HAILEY, PATRICIA L | | | |
| ALEXANDI | RIA, VA 22314 | | | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1755 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003 | 3 | |

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | App | lication No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| t | | 033,920 | KAYAMA ET AL. | Ĺ |
| Office Action Summa | 2024 | miner | Art Unit | |
| | LAU | icia L. Hailey | 1755 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this c | | | | ess |
| eriod for Reply | | | · | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PER THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COM - Extensions of time may be available under the p after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of t - If the period for reply specified above is less that - If NO period for reply is specified above, the mail - Failure to reply within the set or extended period - Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7 tatus | MMUNICATION. rovisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In his communication. n thirty (30) days, a reply within it with the simum statutory period will apply for reply will, by statute, cause months after the mailing date of | n no event, however, may a ithe statutory minimum of thir and will expire SIX (6) MON the application to become Ab | reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this comm 3ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | nunication. |
| 1) Responsive to communication | n(s) filed on <u>13 June 2</u> | <u> 2002</u> . | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . | 2b)⊠ This act | on is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in co | | | | nerits is |
| closed in accordance with the disposition of Claims | e practice under <i>Ex pa</i> | rte Quayle, 1935 C. | D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending | in the application. | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) | • • | m consideration. | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,9,10 and 12-21</u> is | s/are rejected. | | | |
| 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-8 and 11</u> is/are obj | ected to. | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to pplication Papers | restriction and/or elec | tion requirement. | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to | by the Examiner. | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on | is/are: a)□ accepted or | b) objected to by t | he Examiner. | |
| Applicant may not request that | any objection to the draw | ing(s) be held in abey | ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction | on filed on is: a |)□ approved b)□ c | lisapproved by the Examiner. | |
| If approved, corrected drawings | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is object | • | er. | | |
| riority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 12 | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a | _ , | ity under 35 U.S.C. | § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | |
| a)⊠ All b)∏ Some * c)∏ Nor — | | | | |
| 1.⊠ Certified copies of the p | - | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the p | • | | · · | |
| Copies of the certified of application from the * See the attached detailed Office | International Bureau (| PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | age |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a c | claim for domestic prior | rity under 35 U.S.C. | § 119(e) (to a provisional ap | plication |
| a) The translation of the fore 15) Acknowledgment is made of a | | | | |
| tachment(s) | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Region Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO- | | | Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). Informal Patent Application (PTO-1) | |
| Patent and Trademark Office D-326 (Rev. 04-01) | Office Action S | ummarv | Part of Pa | mer No. 5 |

Art Unit: 1755

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Applicants' Priority Document was filed on March 27, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "molten-salt type catalyst" recited in the instant claims is indefinite.

The word "type" includes elements not actually disclosed or recited and the scope of the claims containing this word is unascertainable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1755

- 5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 7. Claims 1-5, 9, 12-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pennington et al. (U. S. Patent No. 4,943,643).

Pennington et al. teach a molten salt catalyst containing nitrates such as a substantial amount of lithium nitrate (col. 3, lines 22-23), as well as a sodium nitrate-potassium nitrate salt mixture (col. 3, lines 33-36).

Art Unit: 1755

A preferred molten salt catalyst comprises from about 20 to 40 mole percent lithium nitrate and from 60 to 80 mole percent of one or more other alkali metal or alkaline earth metal nitrates, such as mixtures of lithium, sodium, and potassium nitrates. See col. 5, lines 6-20 of Pennington et al.

The molten salt catalyst may also contain a co-catalyst such as silver nitrate, or palladium on alumina. If the co-catalyst is used, it is employed in a catalytically effective amount of less than about 5 weight percent based on the total amount of co-catalyst plus molten salt catalyst. See col. 6, lines 15-55 of Pennington et al. This disclosure is considered to read upon the claim limitations "solid support" (as recited in claims 1 and 5) and "oxidation facilitating ingredient" and "noble metal" (recited in claims 4 and 17-18).

Pennington et al. do not teach or suggest that the molten salt catalyst is "for purifying particulate materials, which are contained in an exhaust gas emitted from an internal combustion engine and contain carbon", as recited in the instant claims.

However, given that the molten salt catalyst disclosed in Pennington et al. contains the same alkali metal nitrates as instantly claimed and contains components that read upon what Applicants' claim as a "solid support" and an "oxidation facilitating ingredient", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expect the molten salt catalyst of Pennington et al. to be able to reasonably function as a catalyst for purifying particulate materials, absent the showing of convincing evidence to the contrary. Further, the phrase "for purifying particulate

Art Unit: 1755

materials, which are contained in an exhaust gas emitted from an internal combustion engine and contain carbon" is considered to be one of intended use and is not given patentable weight.

Because the molten salt catalyst of Pennington et al. contains the same and comparable components as recited in Applicants' claimed "molten-salt type catalyst", one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that the catalyst of Pennington et al. would be useful in purifying particulate materials. It is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

8. Claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pennington (U. S. Patent No. 4,959,486).

Pennington teaches a molten nitrate salt catalyst, which may be a mixture of molten lithium and potassium nitrate. See col. 3, lines 50-55 of Pennington.

The nitrate salt catalyst may be any one of alkali or alkaline earth nitrates, or mixtures thereof. See col. 4, lines 3-6 of Pennington.

Art Unit: 1755

The nitrate salt catalyst may also contain a co-catalyst, such as palladium on alumina, silver nitrate, or an elemental metal, its oxide, or its hydroxide. Examples of the latter include molybdenum oxide. See col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 3 of Pennington.

If used, the co-catalyst is employed in an amount of less than about 5 weight percent, based on the total amount of co-catalyst plus molten salt catalyst. See col. 5, lines 13-18 of Pennington.

The molten salt catalyst is employed in an amount on a weight basis of between about 5 times and about 100 times the total weight of the reactants employed. See col. 5, lines 29-32 of Pennington.

Pennington does not teach or suggest that the molten salt catalyst is "for purifying particulate materials, which are contained in an exhaust gas emitted from an internal combustion engine and contain carbon", as recited in the instant claims.

However, given that the molten salt catalyst disclosed in Pennington contains the same alkali metal nitrates as instantly claimed and contains components that read upon what Applicants' claim as a "solid support" and an "oxidation facilitating ingredient", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expect the molten salt catalyst of Pennington to be able to reasonably function as a catalyst for purifying particulate materials, absent the showing of convincing evidence to the contrary. Further, the phrase "for purifying particulate materials, which are contained in an exhaust gas emitted from an internal combustion

Art Unit: 1755

engine and contain carbon" is considered to be one of intended use and is not given patentable weight.

Because the molten salt catalyst of Pennington contains the same and comparable components as recited in Applicants' claimed "molten-salt type catalyst", one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that the catalyst of Pennington would be useful in purifying particulate materials. It is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 9. Claims 6-8 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The cited references do not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 6-8 and 11, regarding the support material (claims 6-8) and the rare earth nitrates (claim 11).

Art Unit: 1755

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Hailey whose telephone number is (703) 308-3317. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark L. Bell can be reached on (703) 308-3823. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0661.

Lynn Hailey/plh Examiner, Art Unit 1755 January 21, 2003 Mark L. Bell
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700